ORDER OF THE BOARD

surrender of Physician and Surgeon's The License No. G-15250, by respondent, Lawrence G. Krugman, M.D., is accepted by the Medical Board of California, Division of Medical Quality of the State of California. This decision shall become effective on the 1st day July <u>, 199 3</u>. It is so ordered this <u>lst</u> day of <u>July</u> 199<u>3</u>. FOR THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA SVA:mlt EMP.WP

ľ			1
	1	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General	
	2	of the State of California STEVEN V. ADLER,	
	3	Deputy Attorney General, State Bar No. 55392 Department of Justice	
	4	110 West A Street, Suite 700 Post Office Box 85266	
	5	San Diego, California 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 237-7772	
	6	Attorneys for Complainant	
	7		l
	8	BEFORE THE	
	9	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY	
	10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
	11	·	
	12	In the Matter of the Accusation) NO. D-4703 Against:	
	13	-	
	14	LAWRENCE G. KRUGMAN, M.D.) <u>STIPULATION FOR</u> California Men's Colony - Main) <u>SURRENDER OF LICENSE</u> P.O. Box 8101)	
	15	San-Luis Obispo CA 93409	
	16	Physician and Surgeon No.) G-15250)	
	17	Respondent.)	ŀ
	18_		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19		ŀ
	20	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED BY AND BETWEEN THE	-
·· ·	21	PARTIES TO THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER THAT:	
	22	1. Dixon Arnett, complainant, is the Executive Director	
	23	of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs	=
	24	("Board") and is represented by Daniel E. Lungren, Attorney General	 -=
	25	of the State of California by Steven V. Adler, Deputy Attorney	
	26	General.	-
	27	2. Lawrence G. Krugman, M.D. ("respondent") is	_
	28	representing himself in this matter. The respondent has counseled	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

with an attorney concerning the effect of this stipulation which respondent has carefully read and fully understands. The respondent has also reviewed Business and Professions Code section 2307 governing reinstatement of his license.

- 3. Respondent has received and read the Accusation which is presently on file and pending in Case Number D-4703 before the Board, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A.
- 4. Respondent understands the nature of the charges alleged in the Accusation and that, if proven at hearing, such charges and allegations would constitute cause for imposing discipline upon respondent's license issued by the Board.
- 5. Respondent is aware of each of respondent's rights, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses who would testify against respondent, the right to present evidence in his favor and call witnesses on his behalf, or to testify, his right to contest the charges and allegations, and other rights which are accorded to respondent pursuant to the California Administrative Procedure Act (Gov. Code, § 11500 et seq.), including the right to seek reconsideration, review by the superior court, and appellate review.
- 6. Respondent understands that in signing this stipulation rather than contesting the accusation, he is enabling the Medical Board of California of the State of California to issue its order accepting the surrender of his license without further process.
- 7. In order to avoid the expense and uncertainty of hearing, respondent freely and voluntarily waives each and every

one of the rights set forth above, and respondent hereby surrenders Physician and Surgeon's License No. G-15250 for the Board's formal acceptance.

- 8. Upon acceptance of the stipulation by the Board, respondent agrees to surrender and cause to be delivered to the Board both his license and wallet certificate. Respondent further understands that when the Board accepts the surrender of his license, he will no longer be permitted to practice as a physician and surgeon in California.
- acting upon any application for relicensure or reinstatement which respondent ever files in the State of California, the Board shall deem all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. D-4703, to be true and correct and admitted by respondent. Respondent admits the allegations contained in Accusation No. D-4703, which is incorporated by this reference as if set forth in full and is appended as Exhibit A.
- 11. All admissions, agreements and recitals contained in this stipulation are made solely and exclusively for the purpose of settlement of Accusation No. D-4703 against Lawrence G. Krugman, M.D. In the event that this stipulation is rejected for any reason by the Board, it will be of no force or effect for either party.

I concur in the stipulation.

DATED: 23 May 1 1993

DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California

Steven V. Adler
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

1	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California
. 2	RANDALL B. CHRISTISON,
3	Deputy Attorney General 110 West A Street, Suite 700
4	San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (619) 237-7772
5	Attorneys for Complainant
6	
7	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
8	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11	
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:) NO. D- 4703
13	LAWRENCE G. KRUGMAN)
14	8770 Golden Street) ACCUSATION Alta Loma, CA 91701)
15	Physician's & Surgeon's Certificate No. G-15250)
16	Respondent.
17	
18	COMES NOW Complainant Kenneth Wagstaff, who as cause for disciplinary action, alleges:
19	1. Complainant is the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California (hereafter the
20	"Board") and makes and files this accusation solely in his official capacity.
21	LICENSE STATUS
22	2. Respondent Lawrence G. Krugman, M.D. (hereafter referred to as "respondent") is the
23	holder of physician's and surgeon's certificate number G-15250 which was issued on August 19, 1968, and
24	the license is currently in effect. On March 5, 1992, the Superior Court of the County of San Bernardino
25	issued a temporary restraining order preventing respondent from practicing medicine. This restraining order
26	remains in effect.
27	
28	
ŀ	

8

6

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

STATUTES

- 3. This accusation is made in reference to the following statutes of California:
- a. Business and Professions Code Section 2227 provides that the Board may revoke, suspend for a period not to exceed one year, or place on probation, the license of any licensee who has been found guilty under the Medical Practice Act.
 - b. Business and Professions Code Section 2234 provides:

"The Division of Medical Quality shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate, any provision of this chapter.
- "(b) Gross negligence.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts.
- "(d) Incompetence.
- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon. ..."
- c. Business and Professions Code section 2238 provides that violation of state or federal drug laws is unprofessional conduct.
 - d. Business and Professions Code section 822 provides,
 - "If a licensing agency determines that its licentiate's ability to practice his or her profession safely is impaired because the licentiate is mentally ill, or physically ill affecting competency, the licensing agency may take action by any one of the following methods:
 - "(a) Revoking the licentiate's certificate or license.
 - "(b) Suspending the licentiate's right to practice
 - "(c) Placing the licentiate on probation.
 - "(d) Taking such other action in relation to the licentiate as the licensing agency in its discretion deems proper. . . ."

3.

Accusation

...17

FACTS

- A. San Antonio Community Hospital Suspension of Staff Privileges
- 5. Respondent has been licensed to practice medicine since 1968 and for some period of time has been practicing in the Upland area where he was on staff at San Antonio Community Hospital (hereafter "S A C H"). Sometime during the summer of 1991, other staff members noted behavior on the part of respondent which was inconsistent with quality patient care.
- 6. Following S A C H's investigation, the S A C H Medical Executive Committee ("MEC") determined that respondent "was severely impaired and that immediate action needed to be taken to reduce the substantial likelihood of imminent danger to the health and safety of patients " On September 17, 1991, S A C H summarily suspended his hospital privileges.
- 7. The month following, the MEC ordered the suspension to continue in effect for 12 months after the judicial review hearing. At the expiration of the 12-month period, respondent could apply for reinstatement if two psychiatrists reported he were no longer impaired. Under the compulsion of Business and Professions Code section 805, subdivision (b), S A C H reported this suspension to the Medical Board of California, and as required, submitted the statement of charges which formed the basis of the suspension. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 805.1, subdiv. (a).) These decisions were based upon respondent's mental illness which impaired his ability to practice and upon repeated acts of negligence, incompetence and unprofessional conduct.

B. SACH Patients

- 8. Patient one (Chart 186967) was admitted through the emergency room at S A C H on June 16, 1991, with respondent as her physician. Respondent failed to render care and abandoned her. This is an act of gross negligence and unprofessional conduct.
- 9. Patient two (Chart 187650) was admitted through the emergency room into the intensive care unit on July 5, 1991. Three days thereafter, respondent's wife called to order a staff nurse to discharge the patient immediately. When the nurse refused to accept such an order, respondent's wife called the patient, informing her that if she was not discharged immediately, Medicare would hold the patient responsible for payment. Respondent was aware of his wife's prior similar conduct and was or should have been aware of

17.,

///

such conduct. Permitting and failing to act to prevent this interference with patient care is negligent and unprofessional conduct.

10. Patient three (Chart 187654) was admitted through the emergency room arriving at 12:20 p.m. on July 5, 1991, by respondent at 8:55 p.m. The nurse tried several times to obtain admitting orders from respondent. Finally, at 11:30 p.m., respondent gave admitting orders but did so without examining the patient, and did not examine her until the following morning. When the patient complained on July 7 of the care she was receiving from respondent, he refused to respond to her questions or concerns. On July 9, the patient again complained, particularly about respondent's failure to examine or visit the patient. This failure to treat and examine a patient is gross negligence, incompetence and unprofessional conduct.

C. Domestic Violence Incidents

11. On January 2, 1992, respondent struck and injured his wife, Bernadette Krugman, a person disabled by muscular dystrophy. During the period leading up to and immediately after the battery, respondent was speaking in an irrational, rambling fashion. Respondent also struck and choked his wife on August 1, 1991. On October 12, 1991, respondent slapped her and pulled her hair. Respondent committed these acts while fully aware of her disability.

- 12. During the period 1986 through January 1992, respondent engaged in a course of conduct including numerous incidents of assaults and batteries upon Mrs. Krugman, as well as repeated verbal threats and verbal abuse, including the incidents referred to in paragraph 12, above.
- 13. On January 6, 1992, the superior court of San Bernardino County, in case number RCV 061077, issued a temporary restraining order against respondent ordering him to refrain from contacting, molesting, striking, threatening, sexually assaulting, battering, telephoning or disturbing Mrs. Krugman and further ordering respondent to stay at least 150 yards away from the residence and from the members of the family.
- 14. Petitioner is informed and believes the superior court issued a preliminary injunction against respondent carrying the same restrictions on January 22, 1992, and such injunction currently remains in effect. The acts described in paragraphs 11 through 13 above are acts of unprofessional conduct and are acts evidencing his mental illness which impaired his ability to practice medicine safely.

.17.

D. Concealed Weapon Incident

15. On January 10, 1992, San Bernardino Sheriff's Office Deputy Timothy Smith carried out a consent search of respondent's automobile where he found six rifles, one shotgun, three pistols, and four assault weapons, at least three of the weapons were loaded. Respondent was in violation of Penal Code sections 12025 (possession of concealed weapons) and 12031 (possession of loaded weapons). These acts demonstrate respondent's mental illness which impaired his ability to practice and are acts of unprofessional conduct.

E. Vehicular Manslaughter Incident

16. On January 12, 1992, respondent, while driving the wrong way on a San Diego freeway, crashed head-on into a family car, killing the mother, seriously injuring her 11-year-old son, and injuring the other family members. The direct cause of respondent's aberrant driving was his ingestion of evidently a large quantity of drugs. This is an act of unprofessional conduct and was the result of numerous violations of the narcotics laws as hereinafter alleged.

F. Self-medication and false prescriptions

17. During the period from June 1991 through January 12, 1992, respondent prescribed numerous dangerous drugs and controlled substances to himself. He falsely stated to the pharmacists who filled the prescriptions they were for office use. In fact, respondent consumed the drugs himself. He was not under treatment for any condition for which these medications were indicated and did not consume them for any legitimate medical reasons.

18. During the period from June 1991 through January 12, 1992, respondent prescribed numerous dangerous drugs and controlled substances purportedly to his wife, Bernadette Krugman. The prescriptions he wrote were false and misleading in that they were written by respondent in order to obtain those drugs and substances for his own use. She was not under treatment by respondent for any condition for which these medications were indicated. Respondent did not write these prescriptions for any legitimate medical purpose but rather for the sole purpose of obtaining the drugs for his own consumption.

19. During the period from June 1991 through January 12, 1992, respondent prescribed numerous dangerous drugs and controlled substances purportedly to his mother-in-law, Permilia M. The prescriptions he wrote were false and misleading in that they were written by respondent in order to obtain those drugs

28 ///

and substances for his own use. She was not under treatment by respondent for any condition for which these medications were indicated. Respondent did not write these prescriptions for any legitimate medical purpose but rather for the sole purpose of obtaining the drugs for his own consumption. Respondent wrote these prescriptions by falsely stating her address as the same address as his own.

- 20. Respondent was in possession of a large quantity of prescription drug bottles, 45 altogether (most of them empty) at the time of the January 12, 1992, accident. The labels reflected that he was the prescribing physician and the drugs were prescribed to himself and to two other family members. Most of the drugs were chloral hydrate, hydroxyzine, cyclobenzaprine, diphenhydramine, and Donnatal.
- 21. Respondent possessed the controlled substances and dangerous drugs in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11173 (prescriptions obtained through misrepresentation); section 11157 (false and fictitious prescriptions); section 11153 (prescription not for legitimate medical purpose); section 11174 (prescription obtained through use of false name or address); and sections 11175 and 11180 (possession of controlled substances obtained through a prescription not in compliance with the Uniform Controlled Substances Act).
- 22. Respondent possessed the controlled substances and dangerous drugs in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2239 (self-prescription or administration of a controlled substance or dangerous drugs which impair his ability to practice medicine safely); section 2261 (making or signing of any document directly or indirectly related to the practice of medicine which falsely represents the existence of a state of facts).

Each of these violations are acts of unprofessional conduct and further, these violations proximately caused his incompetence to practice medicine.

- G. Psychiatric disability
- 23. On August 13, 1991, the S A C H medical committee interviewed respondent and found him to be "quite anxious, jittery and under severe stress . . . [and] might be physically ill."
- 24. Following this meeting, respondent was examined by a psychiatrist (H. Mark Carter, M.D.) who found respondent to have "a severe, obsessive-compulsive disorder with depressive features" and "a guarded and somewhat paranoid core of belief."

_
2
3
4
5
6
7
8,
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

during December 1991 and January 1992, his possession of an arsenal of weapons, carried and possessed in an illegal manner, and his self-medication leading to his driving under the influence of drugs. In addition, while in Mexico on January 11 and 12, 1992, he was arrested and detained by the Tijuana police for behavior evidencing mental illness. Those police then transported him to the border where he, while still in the throes of mental illness entered his car and drove the wrong way on the freeway. At the scene of the accident he was acting and speaking in a manner evidencing mental illness, in that his speech was rambling and repetitive and he was expressing paranoid ideas, and was taken tot he San Diego County Mental Health Facility for psychiatric treatment for approximately 24-48 hours.

26. The foregoing conduct as well as the conduct described in paragraphs 5 through 26 above demonstrate respondent's ability to practice medicine is impaired due to mental illness.

WHEREFORE, complainant requests that the Board hold a hearing on the matters alleged herein, and that following said hearing, the Board issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Physician's & Surgeon's Certificate No. G-15250 heretofore issued to respondent Lawrence G. Krugman and,
- 2. Taking such other and further action as the Board deems appropriate to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

DATED: April 8, 1997

ENNETH WAGSTAFF

Executive Director

Medical Board of California

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California

Complainant

c:\krugman\krug-1.acc

27

26